

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF MISSISSIPPI
NORTHERN DIVISION

TYRELL RICHMOND

PETITIONER

V.

CIVIL ACTION NO. 3:23-CV-206-DPJ-ASH

WARDEN COIBERT

RESPONDENT

ORDER

Tyrell Richmond, a federal inmate, petitions pro se under 28 U.S.C. § 2241 challenging prison discipline that cost him a loss of good-conduct time. Pet. [1]. The Respondent prison warden filed a response [10] and a supplemental response [15], but Richmond never replied to either. United States Magistrate Judge Andrew S. Harris recommends denying the petition. R&R [16]. His Report and Recommendation issued on April 22, 2025, from which Richmond had fourteen days to object. Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b)(2); *see* R&R [16] at 7 (advising Richmond of deadline). Richmond has not objected, and his time to do so has passed.

“When no timely objection is filed, the court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.” Fed. R. Civ. P. 72(b) advisory committee’s note (1983), *quoted in Douglass v. United Servs. Auto. Ass’n*, 79 F.3d 1415, 1420 (5th Cir. 1996) (en banc), *superseded on other grounds by* 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1) *as noted in Alexander v. Verizon Wireless Servs., L.L.C.*, 875 F.3d 243, 248 (5th Cir. 2017).

Richmond was found to have violated prison rules by possessing a flash memory card, for which he was docked 41 days of good-time credit along with serving a week in disciplinary segregation and having his phone privileges curtailed. R&R [16] at 2. According to Richmond, he was punished based on false evidence, violating his right to due process. *Id.* at 3. Judge Harris finds that Richmond’s petition is fatally flawed because he failed to show undue prejudice

from the violation—i.e., that his outcome would have been different had the alleged violation not occurred. *Id.* at 4. Under the deferential standard proper to claims like Richmond’s, Judge Harris recommends denying the petition. *Id.* at 6–7. Having reviewed the record and found no clear error, the Court accepts the well-reasoned recommendation of Judge Harris.

IT IS, THEREFORE, ORDERED that the Report and Recommendation of United States Magistrate Judge Andrew S. Harris [16] is adopted as the findings and holdings of this Court. Richmond’s Petition [1] is denied, and a final judgment will be entered. Fed. R. Civ. P. 58(a).

SO ORDERED AND ADJUDGED this the 16th day of May, 2025.

s/ Daniel P. Jordan III

UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE